UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,911	05/30/2001	Robert Russell Cutlip	5577-240	7556

			EXAMINER
20792	7590	12/12/2003	NGUYEN, LOAN B

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _05/30/2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _2_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Dattari (6658453) (hereinafter Dattari).

4.   As per claim 1, Dattari teaches a method of generating an electronic mail message,

comprising: automatically generating an electronic mail message responsive to an action being

performed on a database entry (e.g. col. 2 line 55-67).

1.   As per claim 2, Dattari teaches wherein the step of generating an electronic mail message

comprises:

detecting performance of the action performed on the entry in the database (e.g. col. 5

line 23-40);

triggering a user defined function (UDF) of the database which provides access to an

electronic mail system in response to the detection of performance of the action on the entry (e.g.

col. 10 line 1-5); and

accessing the electronic mail system utilizing the UDF to request generation of the

electronic mail message responsive to the UDF being triggered (e.g. col. 12 line 1-56).

2.   As per claim 3, Dattari teaches wherein the steps of detecting performance of the action

and triggering a user defined function comprise establishing a database trigger associated with

entries in the database which database trigger activates the UDF upon an action being performed

on at least one of the entries associated with the database trigger (e.g. col. 4 line 57-67 and col.

12 line 57-67).

3.   As per claim 4, Dattari teaches wherein the UDF carries out the steps of:

obtaining electronic mail information associated with the entry in the database (e.g. col. 7

line 24-40); and

providing the obtained electronic mail information to an application program interface for

the electronic mail system (e.g. col. 6 line 9-21).

4.   As per claim 12 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

5.   As per claim 5, Dattatri teaches wherein the application program interface provides

abstract layering for the electronic mail system (e.g. col. 6 line 15-21).

6.   As per claim 13 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

5.   As per claim 9, Dattari teaches wherein the UDF comprises a first class which obtains the

electronic mail information and a second class which provides the electronic mail message

information to the electronic mail system (e.g. col. 10 line 35-67 and col. 11 line 53-67).

6.   As per claim 10, Dattari teaches wherein the electronic mail system executes on a second

data processing system remote from a first data processing system on which the database

executes (e.g. col. 12 line 57-67).

7.   As per claim 11, Dattatri teaches a system for generating an electronic mail message,

comprising:

        a database having database entries (e.g. col. 3 line 1-23);

        a user defined function configured to wrap access to an electronic mail system so as to

generate an electronic mail message upon invocation of the user defined function (e.g. col. 5 line

24-30 col. 6 line 9-11); and

        a database trigger associated with at least one of the database entries and configured to

invoke the user defined function upon performance of an action on the at least one of the

database entries (e.g. col. 6 line 5-7).

8.   As per claims 15 and 16 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 6, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dattatri

(6658453) (hereinafter Dattatri) in view of Block (20020120690) (hereinafter Block).

9.   As per claim 6, Dattatri does not specifically teach wherein the application program

interface comprises the JavaMail Application Program Interface.

Block teaches wherein the application program interface comprises the JavaMail

Application Program Interface (e.g. page 1 section [0005]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine Dattatri with Block because it would accomplish to use of standard-base

client such as javamail class library to establish an association between email client and server

via the application interface API.

10.   As per claim 14 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

11.   Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dattatri

(6658453) (hereinafter Dattatri) in view of Chen et al. (20020138497) (hereinafter Chen et al.).

9.   As per claim 7, Dattatri does not specifically teach wherein the action performed

comprises an insertion of the entry into the database.

        Chen et al. teaches wherein the action performed comprises an insertion of the entry into

the database (e.g. page 1 section [0009]).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine Dattatri with Chen et al. because it would accomplish upon detecting a

trigger event, a determination is made of at least one row in database table and inserted a

reference data into the database.

12.   As per claim 8, Dattatri does not specifically teach wherein the database comprises a

DB2 database.

        Chen et al. teaches wherein the database comprises a DB2 database (e.g. page 2 section

[0018]).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine Dattatri with Chen et al. because it would accomplish to use DB2 database

as an email server storing the data information from client.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Loan B. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0358. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Loan B. Nguyen
Examiner

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100